

ways ready to fetch and carry. Senator Tillman had endorsed him for the secretaryship out of gratitude and out of his well known disposition to help his friends.

Baker was given a position in the senate by the late Senator M. C. Butler. When Tillman was a candidate for the senate against Butler, Baker was a partisan of Butler and was very bitter against Tillman. There are a good many people who remember hearing Baker apply the foulest of epithets to Tillman and all his followers. But when Tillman was elected to the senate, and came to Washington and became a power, the situation did not change as quickly as Baker changed. He worked himself into Tillman's good graces; he was "Juick to bend the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning."

And now, after having been taken care of for all these years, he has betrayed his benefactors in his old age, at a time when gratitude would have been the compelling motive in a decent man's heart. Judas Iscariot sold his Master for thirty pieces of silver, but Judas repented.

Many people will recall the fact that when A. C. Latimer first ran for congress Baker fought him most outrageously, and ridiculed the idea of a plain farmer like Latimer being elected to such a position. Yet when Latimer was elected, and began climbing toward the pinnacle that he afterwards reached, Baker quickly became a sycophant and was never so happy as when basking in Latimer's shadow.

As to Immigration.

Dominick's man Baker accuses me of having favored unrestricted immigration and of having introduced a bill with this end in view. The truth is, as both ought to know, that I have always opposed unrestricted immigration, and that the bill I introduced was for the purpose of restricting and weeding out the immigration that threatened to come to South Carolina. My bill was to establish an information bureau at Ellis Island, where most of the immigrants coming to this country are landed, with competent officers in charge, who could look over the incoming immigrants, and after selecting those suited to our people, give them information as to the opportunities and advantages to be found with us. We do need more white people in South Carolina, to supplant the worthless and dangerous negroes on the farms and as laborers and if we can get some of the thrifty people from Germany it will be a blessing to us and to them. Some of the best people that we have in the Third district are descended from immigrant fathers and mothers. They are in Oconee, and Anderson, and Newberry, and in every county in the district. Nobody wants pauper labor, except perhaps a few mill presidents, and a few large land owners who are noted for swindling their tenants. The people of the Third district, in the mill villages and everywhere else, know my position as to immigration, and this eleventh-hour lie will not hurt me. In a recent speech I stated my position on immigration so clearly that no one except Baker and Dominick misunderstood it. I defeated Mr. McCalla on that very issue.

It is charged that I did nothing in support of the Burnett immigration bill, to restrict immigration, in the Sixty-second congress. On January 17, 1913, when the motion to lay the conference report on the table came up, I was absent. I was also absent when the motion was made to recommit the report. When the next vote came up agreeing to the conference report, on Jan. 25, 1913, I was present and was recorded as voting Yea. The bill passed and was sent to President Taft, who vetoed it. On Feb. 19, 1913, there was a vote on the passage of the bill over the president's veto, and I was present and voted Yea. The Congressional Record will cheerfully prove Baker to be a liar if he will turn to page 3429, Sixty-second congress, third session.

The Pure Food Law.

It is charged that I voted against the pure food bill. This is another half-truth, which is worse than outright falsehood. When the bill came before the house I objected to it because it invaded the rights of the States. The bill, as it stood then, would have taken away from the States all their rights and powers in the administration of their health laws and regulations. As a Democrat I could not stand for that, and I voted against it, giving my reasons for doing so. Other Democrats who voted with me were Adamson and Bartlett of Georgia, Burleson of Texas (now postmaster general), John Sharp Williams of Mississippi (now senator), Candler of Mississippi, Garrett of Tennessee, Gillespie of Texas, Henry of Texas, Hill and Humphreys of Mississippi, Moore, Russell and Sheppard (now senator) of Texas, Sherley of Kentucky and Smith of Texas. That was pretty good company, was it not? The bill passed the house and went to the senate, where the objectionable features were stricken out, and when it came back to the house I voted for it, as did the others, and it became a law. I have no apologies to make for me record on that bill.

As to the Speeches.

Baker make the insinuation that I have not written the speeches that I have made in congress, that I have had to get somebody else to prepare them for me. It is rather fatiguing to have to answer such a charge. I have not made as many speeches as some other members, and perhaps they have not been as brilliant as some others, but at any rate they have been mine, AND BAKER KNOWS IT.

Baker says the late Zach McGhee told him of having furnished me with material for a speech. Zach McGhee was my friend. He was a gentleman, and I don't believe he ever spent much time in Baker's company. It is characteristic of Baker to try to prove a falsehood by a dead man. Some years before his death Zach McGhee took a trip through England, and

wrote a series of very interesting newspaper articles telling of his experiences and observations among the laboring people of that country, particularly with reference to wages and the cost of living and the differences in this country because of the high tariff. I took some of these letters and read them into the Congressional Record, giving Mr. McGhee full credit for them. This was not a speech at all, and did not pretend to be, but was merely the introduction of some very valuable data collected by Mr. McGhee for the benefit of the members of congress, as the tariff was then an issue. Those who would like to see the proof that Baker has lied about this, as about other things, may consult the Congressional Record of the second session of the Sixty-first congress, pages 3565 to 3574 inclusive.

Every two years the Democratic campaign committee issues a campaign handbook, for use in the pivotal districts, and for the guidance of Democratic speakers and editors during the campaign. This handbook has been issued five times since I have been in congress, and three times it has contained speeches delivered by me on the floor of the house. I would not detract from the honor or glory of any other man, but I do not believe that any other member of congress has been thus honored by his colleagues during the ten years that I have been in the house. I make no claims to gifts of oratory, but when I do speak or write I have something to say and I tell the truth straight from the shoulder, as I am doing now.

As to Absenteeism.

It is charged that I have been away from the house a great deal while it has been in session, that out of 991 roll calls I was absent 253 times. Charges of this kind have been made against members of congress ever since we have had a congress. I have not taken the trouble to verify the figures as given by Baker, but, assuming that they are correct, which I doubt, I am surprised that I was recorded as voting so many times. The record is a good one, even as they state it. As everybody knows, it has been a custom in congress from time immemorial for members to pair with each other. When a member is obliged to be absent, for illness or for any other reason, he gets a member of the opposite party to pair with him, and then neither will vote until the absent member returns and the pair is broken. This is a courtesy that all members of congress extend to each other. I have had to be away from the house occasionally, while it was in session, on account of illness of myself or members of my family, or on public business, and I have nearly always been paired. I have been in the house a great many times when a vote was taken, and have refrained from voting, because I was paired with some absent member. The pairs are shown in the Congressional Record, but not in the journal of the house. If Dominick and his henchman, Baker, had wanted to be fair they would have quoted from the record, and not from the journal, and would have told the truth about the pairs.

The Chairmanship.

It is charged that I was not made chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia, in spite of seniority, because I had been neglectful of duty in attending the committee meetings and was not equal to the work. At the beginning of the sixty-second congress it was up to me to take this chairmanship, being the ranking member of the committee, but I did not care for it. I knew it meant a great deal of thankless work, and that it might interfere with my duty to my own district and keep me from giving it the close attention which it has been my pride to give it. Representative Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, was next to me on the committee, and was at that time a prospective candidate for governor of his State. He was very keen to get the chairmanship, for the reason that he thought it would help him in his race for governor. I did not know a great deal about Johnson, but had regarded him as my friend, and was quite willing to unload the chairmanship on him. He seemed very grateful, and was profuse in his thanks. He offered to do anything in the world for me, and I asked him to appoint my old friend Doc Owens, a Confederate veteran, who now lives at Greenwood but who once lived at Anderson, as messenger of the committee. This is a position that is not hard to fill, and pays some \$1,100 or \$1,200 a year, and it would have been a godsend to Mr. Owens in his declining years. Mr. Johnson did not keep his promise as to appointing Mr. Owens, and he did not act fairly in other matters, and I quit attending the committee meetings. I am so built that when a man deliberately plays false with me it is hard for me to get over it.

At the beginning of the sixty-third congress I learned that my opponents for reelection would try to use against me the fact that I was not made chairman of the District committee, and would try to make it appear that I had been turned down because of fault of my own. I swallowed my pride and went to Mr. Johnson and asked him if he would be as good to me as I had been to him. I told him that I had given him the chairmanship to help him in his political fortunes, and asked him if he would do the same thing for me. I was not much surprised when he told me that he had defeated me for the chairmanship in a fair fight, and on his merits, and that I had no claim on him. I did not pursue the matter as vigorously as I might have done, for Mr. Johnson had his friends, of course, and I feared that a fight over the chairmanship might open the way for disruption in the party ranks, and I did not want to be responsible for anything of that kind.

But in order to be prepared for just such a slander as this I went to the Democratic members of the ways and means committee (which committee

selects all the other committees of the house), and stated the situation to them and asked for a statement of the facts. They very promptly and gladly gave me the following:

"House of Representatives,
"Washington, April 24, 1913.
"Hon Wyatt Aiken, House of Representatives."

"Dear Sir:—In response to your inquiry we, the members of the committee on ways and means of the sixty-second congress, take pleasure in stating that in the selection of the committee chairmen at the beginning of the sixty-second congress you would have been chosen as chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia if we had not received your declination. There can be no question about this as you were the ranking member of that committee and no other name was considered until after your declination had been received."

"Yours very truly,
(Signed) "O. W. Underwood,
"Henry T. Rainey,
"Cordell Hull,
"A. Mitchell Palmer,
"Claude Kitchen,
"Lincoln Dixon,
"Andrew J. Peters,
"Francis B. Harrison,
"W. S. Hammond,
"D. W. Shackelford,
"Ollie M. James,
"Wm. Hughes."

If Baker will read this statement he will find attached to it the name of Hon. Ollie M. James of Kentucky, who was a member of the Ways and Means committee in the Sixty-second congress, and who is now a United States senator, and whom he has attempted to quote against me.

This ought to be convincing proof, even to Dominick and Baker as to the chairmanship matter, it is true that I have not been attending the meeting of the committee during the Sixty-third congress, and it is also true that my course is approved by my colleagues who understand the situation. I have found plenty of other work to do. I attended one meeting of the committee, when my vote was needed to secure a favorable report on some needed legislation. It sometimes happens that the vote of one honest man is badly needed, and my vote has always been ready when it was needed, in committee or elsewhere. During my entire service in congress I have never failed to vote, or to be paired, on any important issue.

The Anderson Postoffice.

It is charged that I have kept an unworthy man, a Republican, in office as postmaster at Anderson because of political cowardice. This is the first time I have ever been accused of cowardice, and it will probably be the last time. Here are the facts as to the Anderson postoffice:

Soon after President Wilson's inauguration, if not before, it was announced to be the policy of the administration that where Republican postmasters were giving good service, and there were no demands for their removal on the part of the patrons of the office, the postmasters would be allowed to serve out their terms. I opposed that policy then and I am opposed to it now. If I had had my way, every Republican postmaster in the country would have been fired within a month after Wilson's inauguration. But the administration thought the other course should be followed, and I have had to acquiesce.

Some months ago Mr. Cochran, the postmaster at Anderson, and the assistant postmaster and the assistant postmaster's father, after having been friends for a long time, became estranged and some bitter feeling ensued. Serious charges were filed against the postmaster, and a postoffice inspector was detailed to investigate them. When his report came in it was unfavorable to the postmaster. But the officials of the department, having had experience in matters of this kind, and pursuing the policy of taking nothing for granted—and perhaps having reason to believe that the inspector was not without bias or had been deceived in the matter—had another inspector detailed to make an investigation. This inspector had never been to Anderson before, and knew nobody there. He spent several weeks in Anderson, mingling with the people and trying to get at the facts and his report was altogether different from that of the first inspector. Still another inspector made a report, and his report corroborated that of the second inspector. These reports, made wholly independent of each other, tallied in almost every detail. The department officials were thoroughly convinced that the charges against Mr. Cochran were made through spite, and it was clearly established that most of the charges were without foundation while others were grossly exaggerated. The department officials informed me that not sufficient grounds for the postmaster's removal had been shown, and that there was nothing for me to do.

It is true that when the difficulty between the postmaster and the assistant postmaster first occurred some good people at Anderson wrote that they thought the postmaster should be removed. Most of them have since written that they were mistaken, that they did not fully understand the circumstances, and that they thought it would be only justice for him to serve out his term, which expires in December. There are a number of applicants for the office, all of whom are my friends, and every one of them has informed me that he is willing for Mr. Cochran to serve out his term. It is worthy of mention in this connection that there are some 25 or 30 clerks and carriers in the Anderson postoffice. They are as fine and clean a body of men as I have ever known. Every single one of them has sided unreservedly with the postmaster in this affair. Surely, if there had been anything very badly wrong, they would not have stood for it—certainly not all of them.

It is true that three ministers of the city of Anderson did sign a peti-

tion to the president, asking that the postmaster be removed. Two of these, I understand, have recently come to Anderson and they had not had time to get acquainted with conditions. The other minister who signed the petition is pastor of a small church, and, I am told, spends comparatively little of his time in the city. None of the other 20 or more white ministers in the city signed the petition, although most, if not all were asked to do so. Some of them even went so far as to write letters to Washington expressing their disgust with the methods being used against the postmaster, and letting it be known that they were more than willing for him to remain in office until the expiration of his term. These letters are all on file in Washington, and it would have been so easy for Baker to have quoted them if he had been trying to be decent.

Baker characterizes Mr. Cochran as "a drunken sot." Mr. Cochran is able to take care of himself, and Baker will probably be called to account for such language. It is probably true that he has been drinking too much. Any man who drinks at all drinks too much. I can say this, because in my own young manhood I used to drink, but I quit drinking when I was elected to congress and I have not taken a drink since. It is extremely distasteful to make these personal references, but so many slanders have been circulated on me that I would not be at all surprised to learn that the character assassins are saying that I, too, have been a "drunken sot" here in Washington.

So much for the Anderson postoffice. There has been no vacancy, although a desperate effort has been made to create one. I have not tried to keep Mr. Cochran in office, and I have not tried to get him out, for I knew that would be useless unless there was cause. The postoffice department officials say there was not sufficient cause.

But I have been keeping close up with the situation as regards the service, and there has not been one single complaint as to the service given by the postoffice in Anderson. The department officials say the office ranks second to none in the country in point of efficiency. Only recently it has been my pleasure to co-operate in securing better mail service in and out of the city of Anderson, and right now we are working on a plan to improve the delivery service in the city and on the rural routes.

As I have stated, if I had had my way Mr. Cochran and every other Republican postmaster in the country would have been removed long ago. There is a Republican postmaster at Greenville, and there are Republican postmasters still in office at other places in South Carolina and all over the country. As fast as their commissions expire they are being removed and their places filled by Democrats. Baker knows this, if Dominick does

(Political Advertisement.)

To the Democratic Voters of Newberry County:

I have had the honor and pleasure of meeting many of you in the campaign this summer, while there are some that I have not had the privilege and pleasure of meeting. I was in hopes when I entered the campaign that I would meet the whole citizenship of Newberry county, but the Third congressional district covers a very large territory—six counties, and the campaign being so short, I have not seen as many of my fellow Democrats as I wished to.

But gentlemen: On next Tuesday, the 25th day of August, you will go to the polls and cast your vote. I trust, for the best man for the high office of Congressman. I ask you, one and all, to consider my fitness for the office before you cast your ballot—think it over seriously, and if you vote for me I pledge you my word as a God fearing man that if I am elected congressman that I will fill that position with credit, and I further promise that I will not expect you to give me the congressmanship indefinitely. I will not have the nerve to ask you to give the Horton family this honor for 20 years.

I will receive a flattering vote throughout the district and I am assured that your county will give me a handsome vote.

I wish in advance to thank each of you for the vote I will receive on next Tuesday—and at any time—whether I am elected or not I can serve you, call on me, and I will take pleasure in doing so.

I am not boasting, but I feel gratified and confident over the results of the primary next Tuesday.

All I ask is a square deal. Everybody who knows me will tell you that I will work hard for the good of the whole congressional district—will always be on hand to vote on the measures coming before congress, and when I return to my district I assure you that my record will be above reproach.

In closing, gentlemen, I wish again to thank you for the vote you give me on next Tuesday, August 25.

Your humble servant,

(Signed)

JOHN A. HORTON.

Summerland College

For Young Women!

COURSES: Literary, Music, (Piano, Voice, Violin.)

Preparatory course for those not sufficiently advanced to enter College.

Next Session Begins Sept. 16

For catalogue address

P. E. MONROE,
Leesville, S. C.

voted just as I did. The charge that we lined up with the Republicans is false, for it was not a party question, and the Republicans were as badly divided as the Democrats. The charge that in favoring free tolls we were favoring a ship subsidy is equally false. On the other hand, if the coast wise ships using the canal have to pay tolls they will have to charge higher rates, and that will be in the interest of the railroads, their competitors, so that making the ships pay tolls is a form of railroad subsidy. As a matter of fact Great Britain never raised the question of free tolls until it was brought up by the Tehuantepec Railroad in Mexico, and the Canadian Pacific Railroad, both of which are owned by British interests. In repealing the provision for free tolls for vessels engaged in coastwise shipping we were legislating directly for the benefit of this English owned railroad in Mexico and this English owned Canadian railroad, and the trans-continental railroads in our own country, and no sensible man can deny that fact. The more I think about my vote on the canal tolls question the more convinced I am that I was right, politically, economically and in every other way.

Several persons have stated that they heard Mr. Dominick say, just after this vote was taken, that if he had been in congress he would have